in the department of geology at Cincinnati University, has been appointed lecturer in geology to succeed Dr. D. W. Ohern.

AT Harvard University, Paul Hayhurst, A.B., has been appointed instructor in economic entomology.

THE following appointments have been made in the College of Applied Science, the State University of Iowa: Mr. Sherman Melville Woodward, M.S., Washington University, 1893, M.A., Harvard, 1896, joint author with Mr. Charles E. Lucke of "Tests of Internal-Combustion Engines on Alcohol Fuel," and in collaboration with Mr. John Preston, translator of E. Sorrel's "Carbureting and Combustion in Alcohol Engines," has been made professor of hydraulics and engineering materials, and acting head of the department of mechanical engineering. Professor Woodward at the time of his appointment was supervising engineer in the United States Department of Agriculture. Mr. Arthur Warren Hixson, A.B. (Kansas, 1907), has been appointed instructor in mining and metallurgy, in charge of the department of mining; Mr. John E. Boynton, B.S., M.E. (Wisconsin, 1905), instructor in steam engineering; Mr. John Hoffman Dunlap, A.B. (Dartmouth, 1905), C.E. (Thayer School of Civil Engineering, 1908), instructor in descriptive geometry and drawing; Mr. Wallace Woodman Smith, B.S., C.E. (Pennsylvania State College, 1908), instructor in descriptive geometry and drawing; Mr. George John Keller, instructor in shopwork.

AUSTIN teaching fellows at Harvard University have been appointed as follows: Ralph Ernest Chase, A.M., history; John Detlefsen, A.B., zoology; Warren MacPherson, S.B., A.M., comparative pathology; Frank Linden Richardson, M.D., surgery. Newly-appointed assistants include: Edward Allen Boyden, zoology; Eugene James Cardarelli, chemistry; Edward James Curran, M.D., anatomy; Richard Dexter, A.B., M.D., clinical medicine; Gustavus John Esselen, Jr., Augustus Henry Fisk, A.M., Gorham Waller Harris, A.B., and William Hammett Hunter, A.M., chemistry.

DISCUSSION AND CORRESPONDENCE

THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE ASSOCIATION OF OFFICIAL AGRICULTURAL CHEMISTS

TO THE EDITOR OF SCIENCE: The *Proceedings* of the Association of Official Agricultural Chemists for 1907 have just been published as bulletin No. 116 of the Bureau of Chemistry, U. S. Department of Agriculture. By order of the printing committee of the department, the portion of the *Proceedings* referring to the report of the committee on the president's address, 1906, has been omitted in the bulletin, as was also the president's address itself in the printed *Proceedings* for the preceding year (bulletin No. 105, Bureau of Chemistry, U. S. Department of Agriculture).

It may be stated in explanation of these omissions that the president's address delivered at the annual convention of the association, October, 1906, among other matters, discussed recent publications of the Bureau of Soils of the U. S. Department of Agriculture and took decided issue with views set forth therein. The president's address having been published elsewhere (see below), it would seem only right that members of the association and men of science in general, who are interested in the questions at issue, or in the larger question of the liberty of free speech, shall be given an opportunity to become acquainted with the report of the committee; on behalf of the committee, I would ask, therefore, that the enclosed portion of the proceedings of the association referring to the report, as prepared by the secretary of the association, be printed in SCIENCE.

F. W. WOLL

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN,
MADISON, WIS.

In the absence of Chairman Woll, Mr. Van Slyke presented the report in behalf of the committee on the president's address:

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS (1906)

By resolution of this association at its last convention it became the duty of your committee, "after consultation with the Secretary of Agri-

culture, to consider in detail the questions raised" in the president's address.[1] These duties your committee has performed and now desires to present the following report and be discharged.

The character of the work assigned us is new and without precedent. The essential facts appear to be that the president of this association, in his inaugural address, speaking on the duty of science to agriculture in guarding against error as well as in discovering truth, expressed views antagonistic to those published by one of the bureaus of the Department of Agriculture and criticized adversely certain of its published doctrines, designating the publications specifically and the bureau by name. These being the facts, as your committee understands them, there seem to be three pertinent questions to be considered:

First, Is it proper for an officer of this association to criticize the published work or doctrines of an institution or of individuals?

Second, Is the association responsible therefor?

Third, Did the president correctly state and construe the facts, observations or statements upon which he based his criticisms?

As to the first question, your committee is of the opinion that liberty of criticism of this sort is entirely proper and, more than this, is necessary to the existence of a scientific deliberate body. Free discussion, such as obtains the world over among scientific men, spoken in convention and printed in journals, is indispensable to progress. To suppress what one conceives to be the truth, because it does not accord with the views of colleagues, is an enormity hardly conceivable to liberal-minded men. This principle, once admitted to govern our proceedings, would put an end to the association's usefulness.

As to the second question, it is the sense of your committee that the association is not in any degree responsible for the views expressed by its members in debate or public addresses. That, beyond enforcing ordinary parliamentary laws and courtesy, the association does not and should not exercise censorship over debate or other discussion. Views expressed by members are to be understood as their personal opinions. The association is responsible only for that which it has authorized by formal vote.

In attempting to answer the third question we have carefully verified the figures and statements quoted in the address, by comparison with the publications from which they were derived and by correspondence with the persons familiar with the investigations under discussion. We find them accurately stated and properly used in a legitimate scientific discussion of matters of the greatest interest and importance to agricultural chemists. In our opinion, the facts as stated in the president's address are essentially correct.

As supplementary to this report, your committee submits as exhibits to be filed the following documents bearing upon its work and leading to its conclusion:

A. Letter from Chairman Woll to the Secretary of Agriculture.

B. Answer to same from the Secretary, January 19, 1907.

C. Letter of March 25 from the secretary transmitting Circular 22.

D. Circular 22 from the office of the Secretary of Agriculture.

E. Statement of Dr. Hopkins in regard to Circular 22.

F. Letter from Director Thorne explaining his position.

G. Circular 70 of the Ohio Station relative to Circular 22.

H. Circular 105 of the Illinois Station, being the president's address, as published in pursuance of the resolutions of the association.

I. Bulletin 167 of the Ohio Station.

J. Farmer's Bulletin No. 257 of the Department of Agriculture.

K. A detailed discussion of the issues involved under question No. 3 above, prepared by Chairman Woll with the assistance of some other members of the committee.

(Signed)

L. L. Van Slyke,	B. B. Ross,
Jacob G. Lipman,	F. W. Woll,[2]
R. J. Davidson,	A. M. Peter.[2]

Mr. Lipman spoke at some length concerning the necessity of the association fulfilling its duty both to the farmer and to the scientific world in taking no equivocal position in regard to the methods of scientific research,

[1] President Hopkins's address on the duty of chemistry to agriculture, 1906, was published as Circular 105 of the Illinois Station.

[2] The signature of the absent chairman of the committee, F. W. Woll, and that of A. M. Peter were appended subsequent to the meeting, the report having been submitted to them. The other absent member of the committee, Mr. C. L. Penny, signified his agreement to the report in the main, but took exception to one phase of it, and his name, therefore, does not appear.

approving only such as maintain the highest plane of intellectual integrity and conservatism in the deduction of conclusions from the facts.

President Hopkins is in no need of vindication by a committee of this association. The facts in the case speak for themselves and every chemist and student of soils whose opinion is at all worthy of respect will amply sustain him in the interpretation of these facts. The unanimous action of the committee was inspired, above all else, by the desire to discharge a duty to those who rely on the association as an authority as to strictly scientific methods of research, and the practical application of the results of such work to agriculture. The members of the association are not only affiliated with control and research work, but frequently serve also as teachers in our agricultural schools. They should not, therefore, shirk the moral responsibility imposed upon them. A negative attitude could not be assumed in the discussion under consideration, nor could it be honestly ignored.

The report of the committee was adopted by the association.

APPOINTMENTS IN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

TO THE EDITOR OF SCIENCE: The question raised by Professor Wenley in SCIENCE, August 21, as regards the desirability that each great department of inquiry should establish a "bureau of information to bring men and places together," appears to me to relate to a need which deserves the ventilation suggested by Professor Wenley, with a view to common action. Probably no department feels this need more than that of mathematics in view of the fact that so few people are familiar with the real nature of advanced work in mathematics, or, in the more emphatic words of Sir Oliver Lodge, that "the mathematical ignorance of the average educated person has always been complete and shameless." This fact has too frequently led authorities to accept men at their own avowed estimate, or at the estimate of some friends who did not take the matter very seriously, since they were not held responsible for their advice by the men who really understood the situation.

While publications like "American Men of Science" render valuable assistance, yet this service is far from complete in view of the facts that the grouping in such a work cannot be sufficiently minute, nor can the issues, with up-to-date changes, be sufficiently frequent to afford just the information that is generally needed by those entrusted with the filling of important positions. In considering this question the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching in its Bulletin Number Two, issued May, 1908, calls attention to the method adopted in the choosing of professors in the Italian universities, which has shown excellent results. The main feature of this method is that the professor is finally chosen by a jury of five professors of the same subject or of a kindred subject to that in which the vacancy exists. In the selection of this jury the faculty of each of the twenty-one Italian universities is invited to vote for five men, and the minister of public instruction chooses five names from amongst the ten having the highest votes.

In sharp contrast to this method stands the inbreeding system followed by most of the larger American institutions, and the still more vicious system adopted by many of the smaller institutions as well as by some of the larger ones, according to which the vacancy is made known to only a few trusted individuals in order to avoid the examination of the credentials of a large number of applicants. One of the principal objections to the system of inbreeding is that it does not emphasize sufficiently high scholarly attainments and tends to encourage superficiality, which frequently attracts local attention, but seldom receives national recognition. It is said that chiefs of divisions under the federal government are frequently surprised at finding, by means of the civil service, men of very high ability who had been hitherto entirely unknown outside of their own regions. Such discoveries would be of the greatest importance to the college and the university,